

March 9, 1967

Probably no other country has a worker capital investment ratio as high. These advantages must outweigh our fortunate disadvantage of high wage rates.

Two years after the end of World War II the United States was enjoying a trade surplus of over \$1 billion. Last year the United States imported \$902 million more in textiles than it exported. Our \$1 billion advantage reversed to nearly as great a disadvantage in the period since 1947. Our trade balance overall is not strong enough to absorb the brunt of this drain on our gold supply.

In 1961, we were importing 964 million square yards of textiles of all types; in 1962 we bought 1,543 million square yards from abroad; in 1963, 1,494 million square yards; 1964 saw imports rise again to 1,523 million square yards; in 1965, imports jumped to 2,083 million square yards, and last year, while imports of wools decreased, imports of cotton and manmade fibers pushed the figure to 2,371 million square yards.

Mr. President, freer movement of goods between friendly nations is to be desired: our policy should basically strive for that goal. Trade and commerce are, indeed, valuable tools for encouraging enduring friendship between already friendly nations. Trade protection is best used as a tool to be used sparingly and in an enlightened manner—an aid for a time to cushion vast economic distress.

I do not doubt, Mr. President, that the situation which confronts the American textile industry is serious; and I believe we may properly act to restrain textile imports at this time. I urge we do so. It is now time for serious consideration of the feasibility of providing some effective governmental relief.

UNITED STATES SHOULD OPENLY FINANCE STUDENT TRAVEL TO INTERNATIONAL YOUTH CONFERENCES

MR. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an excellent column published in the New York Times of March 7, Tom Wicker asks:

Is there any reason why an American delegation to a world youth festival cannot be financed openly and honorably by the Federal Government, or by one of the private foundations untainted by CIA money?

Mr. Wicker feels that "there is no reason and there never was any reason except the reluctance of Congress to appropriate such money."

Whatever may have been the political realities of the past that would have made it difficult to get Congress to appropriate funds for international student conferences, the situation is different today. Congress should authorize and appropriate funds so that American students with their expenses openly supported by their Government can represent the United States at these international conferences. In this regard I have introduced S. 981, a bill to amend the International Education Act of 1966, in order to authorize grants to individuals broadly representative of American stu-

dents for travel to international youth conferences.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wicker's article entitled "Vive la Difference" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IN THE NATION: VIVE LA DIFFERENCE

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, March 6.—President Johnson's special representatives are studying the Central Intelligence Agency to see what changes, if any, should be made following the discovery that the agency had penetrated a number of private organizations while carrying out its work.

The difficulty is that no conceivable recommendation can reach the most difficult problem that has been disclosed—the attitudes of the men who carry out secret operations, of those supposed to be in "control" of them, and of the politicians who underwrite the effort.

The New York Times published this morning a compilation of the views of many of these men, none of whom could be quoted and few of whom will even talk to the press under normal circumstances. It was a disturbing account.

PUBLIC BLAMED

Those interviewed appeared to be upset only at what they considered a setback to their program. They believed it now would be harder for them to do their work. And they tended to blame a naive public for not understanding the nature of the challenge.

They made it clear that they regarded the United States as in a battle with "Communism" for influence in other countries; that they thought this battle could only be won with the aid of extensive covert expenditures and propaganda; and that whatever "the other side" did in this war had to be matched by "our side."

Now that the C.I.A.'s secret connection with the National Student Association has been broken, for instance, the intelligence men fear there will be no American delegation at the world youth festival in Sofia next year; and one said that "the question is whether the international youth movement is going to be taken over completely by the Communists without a fight."

MORE IMPORTANT QUESTION

But there is a more important question: Is there any reason why an American delegation cannot be financed openly and honorably by the Federal Government, or by one of the private foundations untainted by C.I.A. money?

There is no reason and there never was any reason except the reluctance of Congress to appropriate such money; that is why the C.I.A. has had to hand it out secretly. But if student activities are as important as the agency rightly claims, if American representation at Sofia and elsewhere is now endangered, surely the Administration could make a good case in Congress for the small amounts needed, especially since the publicity of recent disclosures.

That not only would provide representation, it would provide it honestly and openly, without taint of espionage. And if its Government sponsorship would then be public knowledge, certainly the government sponsorship of Communist delegations is as widely known.

VITAL PROPAGANDA

The officials interviewed laid great stress on the vital importance of propaganda and secret influence in other countries. As one man said, putting "a little money" into a free labor union "to keep it alive" may be necessary; but can it only be done by subverting similar organizations in our own society? And can it really be contended

that secret tampering with and subsidization of governments, institutions and individuals in other countries is anything but a sort of last-ditch stand made necessary only by the failure or absence of other, more open means?

Such means exist: effective aid to hard-pressed economies, for instance (which Congress is so reluctant to vote); sensible assistance, education and training programs; friendly and understanding efforts to help people help themselves; even military protection, if that becomes necessary. Such efforts to help the underprivileged of the world begin to realize their aspirations simply dwarf the importance of secret operations, propaganda and purchased influence.

It may be more glamorous, easy and acceptable in Congress to fight "Communism"—if there is any such monolithic force as the term implies—with covert operations and "dirty tricks," rather than with aid, understanding, friendship and example. But to accept the view that whatever the "other side" does has to be done by "our side" is the moral equivalent of justifying the means by the end; it is the political negation of the idea that there are democratic, American means of accomplishing worthwhile ends; and it begs the question whether, in the long run, there is any real difference between "our side" and "the other side" worth fighting about.

No one can deny that there is a struggle in the world from which Americans cannot escape, but some of them will persist in believing that there is a difference in what this nation and its adversaries stand for, and that that difference requires of us not only the fight itself but different means of waging it. If that be naïveté, make the most of it.

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION STATEMENT ON DEFERRAL OF HIGHWAY FUNDS

MR. BAYH. Mr. President, on February 27 and 28 the Senate and House Committees on Public Works held joint hearings on the deferment of Federal aid to highways. The fact that such an almost unprecedented step was taken is a clear indication of the seriousness of the problem as well as congressional concern for the future of the vital Interstate System.

On February 27, Mr. Alan Boyd, Secretary of Transportation, announced that \$175 million in deferred funds was being released immediately—a comparatively small sum in itself but an indication that the administration was moving in the right direction. Mr. Boyd's welcome news was followed on Tuesday by the testimony of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Charles Schultze. Mr. Schultze stated that additional funds probably would be released shortly. In addition, President Johnson has implied that a significant restoration of highway trust fund money could be expected before the end of the fiscal year. On the basis of these good faith statements the joint committee voted to recess the hearings subject to the call of the distinguished chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and Representative FALLON.

Mr. President, due to the sudden change in the committee's schedule, a number of witnesses who had been asked to testify did not have the opportunity to appear in person. Although their statements will in time be printed in the hearing record, some of them deserve